UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/838,205	04/20/2001	Srikanth Natarajan	10007592/021	9389

7590   06/05/2007

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
HOSSAIN, TANIM M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 January 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

In view of the Appeal Brief filed on January 10, 2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lecheler (U.S. 6,425,008) in view of Schumacher (U.S. 6,978,265).

As per claim 1, Lecheler teaches a method for identifying the source of an event in a computer network, comprising the steps of: associating an identifier tag with an event occurring within the computer network, wherein the identifier tag uniquely identifies a collection computer monitoring the event based on a domain name (column 2, lines 47-54; column 4, lines 30-40; figure 4, step 116, 118); receiving, in a management computer, information from the collection computer that includes the identifier tag (column 6, line 66 – column 7, line 5; figure 4, step 120); deriving, by the management computer, an identification of the collection computer from the identifier tag based on the domain name (column 4, lines 47-57; column 4, line 66 – column 5, line 5; column 6, line 66 – column 7, line 5); and identifying to a user the source of the event using the identification of the at least one collection computer (column 5, lines 7-9, 63-66; column 6, line 66 – column 7, line 5; figure 5). Lecheler does not specifically teach that the collection and management computers for a certain domain may be implemented by multiple computers. Schumacher teaches the implementation of multiple management and collection computers for a single domain (Figure 1; column 3, line 56 – column 4, line 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the use of multiple collection and management computers to correspond to a certain domain, as taught by Schumacher in the system of Lecheler. The motivation for doing so lies in the fact that

additional collection and management computers would allow for the accommodation of a large

number of computers within a certain domain, such that the increase in collection/management

computers would more efficiently serve a larger population within the domain.

As per claim 2, Lecheler-Schumacher teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the

identifier tag is a name of the at least one collection computer (Lecheler: column 4, lines 49-52).

As per claim 3, Lecheler-Schumacher teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of

deriving comprises the step of: maintaining within the at least one management computer a

database of identification information associated with identifier tags (Lecheler: figure 3; column

5, line 66 – column 6, line 4).

As per claim 4, Lecheler-Schumacher teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of

identifying comprises the step of: displaying to the user the identification of the at least one

collection computer (Lecheler: column 4, lines 32-34). Lecheler-Schumacher does discuss the

display of a network address of a network element that generated an event, but chooses not use it

in the invention. Instead, Lecheler-Schumacher teaches the display of a resolved network

address of a network element that generated an event, as it would be more convenient to convert

these network addresses into unique domain identifiers for efficient identification (Lecheler:

column 6, lines 13-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to

include displaying the network address of a network element that generated an event, as it is a

different option of displaying the required information.

As per claim 5, Lecheler-Schumacher teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of

identifying comprises the step of: mapping each collection computer to a group of collection

computers using the identifier tag (Lecheler: column 5, line 66 – column 6, line 1). Lecheler-

Schumacher does discuss the identification to the user the source of the event using the group of

collection computers (Lecheler: column 6, lines 5-12). Using the network address of a network

element that generated the event, to identify the source of the event to the user, would have been

obvious by the same argument as claim 4.

As per claim 6, Lecheler-Schumacher teaches the method of claim 1, comprising the

steps of: managing, by the collection computer, at least one network object (Lecheler: figure 1;

column 3, lines 57-60; column 4, lines 19-21); and resolving, by the collection computer, a

network address of each network object into a resolved network address included in the

information received at the at least one management computer (Lecheler: column 4, lines 47-49;

column 5, lines 5-8).

As per claim 7, Lecheler-Schumacher teaches a system for identifying the source of an

event in a computer network, comprising: a plurality of collection computers, wherein an

identifier tag uniquely identifies each collection computer or group of collection computers

based on a domain name, and wherein the identifier tag is associated with an event occurring

within the computer network (Lecheler: figure 1; column 2, lines 52-54; column 4, lines 28-34;

figure 4, steps 116, 118; figure 5; Schumacher: Figure 1; column 3, line 56 – column 4, line 12);

at least one management computer for receiving information from the plurality of collection

computers that includes the identifier tag, wherein each management computer derives an

identification of each collection computer or group of collection computers from the identifier

tag based on the domain name (Lecheler: figures 1, 4a, and 4b; column 4, lines 47-57; column 4,

line 66 – column 5, line 5; Schumacher: Figure 1; column 3, line 56 – column 4, line 12); and

means for identifying to a user the source of the event using the identification of each collection

computer or group of collection computers (Lecheler: column 5, lines 7-9, 63-66; figure 5;

Schumacher: Figure 1; column 3, line 56 – column 4, line 12).

Response to Arguments

Appellant's arguments in the Appeal Brief, filed on January 10, 2007 have fully been

considered, and as such, a new ground of rejection is hereby issued.

a. In regards to the argument that the Lecheler system does not allow more than one level

1 manager, and that that disclosure teaches away from the Appellant's invention, examiner

respectfully disagrees. Lecheler discloses the use of any number of computers and managers,

and in the common situation such that managed computers become too numerous for a manager

within a domain, one of ordinary skill in the art would obviously contemplate the

implementation of at least another manager computer, so as to share the load between the

computers. Such an implementation is common in the art.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Tanim Hossain whose telephone number is 571/272-3881. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571/272-3933. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tanim Hossain
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2145

JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER